REMARKS

In the Office Action,[1] the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 on the ground of non-statutory double patenting in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,535,854 to Buchner et al. ("*Buchner*") and U.S. Patent No. 6,119,088 to Ciluffo ("*Ciluffo*").

Claims 1-11 remain pending in this application.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-11 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting, as being allegedly patentably indistinct from claims 1-22 of *Buchner* in view of *Ciluffo*.

Independent claim 1 of this application recites a voice recognition control system "whereby the second electronic device initiates registration of the second voice recognition table by requesting permission to transfer the second voice recognition table to the control means."

The claims of *Buchner* do not require the "second electronic device" of claim 1 of this application, and *Ciluffo* does not teach or suggest the claimed "second electronic device."

Claim 18 of *Buchner*, for example, recites "send[ing] a control-network-command from a control unit . . . to said remotely controllable device to control said device to transmit device or medium dependent user-network-commands to control said device." Claim 18 of *Buchner* does not require a "second electronic device [that] initiates registration . . . by requesting permission" as recited in claim 1 of this application. Instead, *Buchner's* claimed "remotely controllable device . . . transmit[s] device or

---

[1] The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

medium dependent user-network-commands to said device" in response to "a control-network-command [sent] from a control unit." Indeed, *Buchner's* claims are silent with respect to the claimed "requesting permission."

Ciluffo does not cure the deficiencies of *Buchner's* claims.

Ciluffo discloses determining if a speech pattern of received audio matches a stored pattern for a person authorized to control the appliance. However, *Ciluffo* does not disclose or suggest a "second electronic device [that] initiates registration of the second voice recognition table by requesting permission to transfer the second voice recognition table to the control means."

Buchner's claims, even when combined with the teachings of *Ciluffo*, do not teach or suggest a voice recognition control system "whereby the second electronic device initiates registration of the second voice recognition table by requesting permission to transfer the second voice recognition table to the control means." Accordingly, claim 1 and the claims of *Buchner* are patentable distinct.

Independent claim 7 of this application, while of different scope than claim 1, is patentably distinct from *Buchner's* claims for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 2-6 and 8-11 depend from one of claims 1 and 7.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge

any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 16, 2009   By: /Michael R. Kelly/
                                   Michael R.Kelly
                                   Reg. No. 33,921